make them believe that Kashmir is a separate nation and should therefore be separated from India. As long as Sheikh Abdullah was alive secessionists could not play their games. But today the problem of Kashmir has raised its ugly head only because Sheikh Abdullah's son after his father's death showed much more interest on foreign tours and opportunistic politics than on the law and order problem and welfare of the country. Hence there are social, political, economic and historical reasons behind the Kashmir problem.

(Speech not concluded)

5.00 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At 5 o' clock, the Minister of External Affairs is to make a statement. If you finish your speech within five minutes, I will allow; otherwise you can speak tomorrow.

DR. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY: I will speak tomorrow, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of External Affairs to make a statement.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Talks between Foreign Ministers of India and Pakistan at New York

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Madam, Honourable Members are aware that I visited New York from the 22nd to the 26th April, 1990 to participate in the Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to International Economic Cooperation and in the Non-aligned Foreign Ministers' meeting connected with this Special Session. I had extensive discussions with my counterparts from a large number of countries during my stay in New York.

The background to the meeting with Pakistan Foreign Minister was the tensions and aberrations created in Indo-Pak relations due to Pakistan's involvement generating extremism and violence in Jammu and Kashmir. Despite Pakistan's obdurate attitude on this issue, the Government of India had kept lines of communication open with authorities in Pakistan to avoid confrontation and to resuscitate the process of normalisation and stability in Indo-Pak relations.

In conformity with India's commitment to conduct relations with Pakistan in the spirit of bilateralism inherent in the Simla Agreement, I took advantage of my visit to New York to have a detailed exchange of views with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan Sahabzada Yakub Khan on the 25th April, 1990.

During the course of this meeting I reiterated that Pakistan's continued intervention in Jammu and Kashmir and its support and encouragement to terrorism there was not conducive to maintenance of peace in our region and that such an approach would be detrimental to Indo-Pak relations. I stressed that adventurist brinkmanship on the part of Pakistan in relation to Jammu and Kashmir might generate unpredictable events which might become uncontrollable.

I told him that since our last meeting, in January of this year, instead of listening to my advice for restraint, Pakistan had stepped up interventionist actions in the Punjab and Kashmir through training and supply of arms to subversives and incitement to violence. Belligerent and inflammatory rhetoric exhorting people to resort to arms was being indulged in at very responsible political levels. Calls for a 'Thousand Years War' and for 'Jehad' were being issued from the same quarters. Special Kashmir Funds for supporting insurgency had been created. Government-sponsored media campaign had increased mani-

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

fold. Advertisements were appearing in the press asking for recruits for 'Jehad'. Fatehas were being read in Mosques and in the Parliament for the terrorists. A Pakistani citizen sitting in USA was owning up responsibilities for kidnappings and killings, and also openly asking his so-called followers to assassinate the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in India. Reports had appeared in the Pakistani press stating that the Pakistan government had sought the assistance of the United States government for facilitating the mission of this Pakistani citizen in the United States. Efforts were being made to send Pakistani citizens across the line of actual control. There had already been three instances of Pakistani citizens crossing the Line of Actual Control.

I impressed upon the Pakistan Foreign Minister that if Pakistan indeed sought peace and friendship, it must take tangible and credible measures to withdraw support to terrorism and desist from intervention in our internal affairs. Concrete evidence of this happening alone would provide the point of departure for building up friendly relations with Pakistan.

The Pakistan Foreign Minister denied that Pakistan was encouraging subversion and terrorism in India and reiterated Pakistan's well-known position regarding Kashmir and "self-determination".

I told Sahabzada Yakub Khan that Pakistan could not gloss over the facts and that it was still not too late for Pakistan to withdraw from the brinkmanship.

During the course of the discussion, the Pakistan Foreign Minister made the patently propagandist suggestion that we invite the United Nations or any other outside agency to confirm the factual situation on the ground and to provide a "neutral surveillance mechanism". I have rejected this suggestion and reminded him that both countries had consciously agreed on the irrelevance and redundancy of the third party involvement in bilateral relations in the Simla Agreement, long ago. I also pointed out that his suggestion was neither helpful nor feasible. He should know that no international agency could effectively monitor clandestine assistance to terrorists. There was no alternative to Pakistan taking appropriate and credible measures in order to create confidence and demonstrate its seriousness about improving relations with India.

At the end of the talks similarly worded press statements were made:

> "The two Foreign Ministers had a frank, business like and useful exchange of views. Both sides agreed that tension should be reduced and confrontation avoided. For this purpose, it was agreed that:
>
> (a) The Director General of Military Operations of India and Pakistan should remain in touch with each other;
>
> (b) Both sides should exercise restraint; and
>
> (c) Channels of communications should be kept open at all levels."

My bilateral talks with the Pakistan Foreign Minister were frank and businesslike. They were useful in that they offered me the opportunity to impress upon the Pakistan Foreign Minister the dangers inherent in their policy of supporting terrorism and subversion in India and the need on their part to take urgent remedial action. We are watching the situation. We have kept communication channels open and if Pakistan gives concrete evidence on the ground, of applying restraint. This will pave the way for normalisation and improvement of our bilateral relations.

Before concluding, I would like to reiterate that India is wedded to

peace, however GOI would like it to be clearly understood that it would not tolerate infringements of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I have a list before me of 18 Members who want to seek clarifications. There is a reception by the Chairman at 6-15 P.M. today for the new Members. I would, therefore, request the honourable Members to be very brief while seeking their clarifications. Now, Mr. Kapil Verma.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, the results of the Foreign Ministers' talks in New York, in my opinion, are modest and limited and they are useful only in the sense that the line of communication will remain open between the armies of the two countries and they would be useful in a crisis situation. Otherwise, I think, the two sides have only reiterated their old positions and the result, I am afraid, is not very good in the sense that Shahibzada Yakub Khan, within 48 hours of the joint declaration or identical statement, has reverted to his old position, probably submitting to the hawks in his own country. The first question that I want to ask the Minister is: What is the Government's assessment of Pakistan's intensions in the light of Pakistani Foreign Minister's outburst against India—because he has said he did not rule out war—even after that statement, after that outburst against India, particularly after the New York talks and after the statement he issued, after his outburst in the United States at a press conference in New York? The second thing is and there is some controvery about it: Who took the initiative for the talks? Because, there has been a controversy both in the Indian and in the Pakistani press about it. And we all know the United States put pressure on Pakistan to go to talks; otherwise, they would not have. In any case, it is for the Minister to tell us. Then, India was also proposing meetings of commissions and sub-[illegible] asking Pakistan to join the meetings but Pakistan was avoiding on one pretext or the other in January, in February, in March and the last pretext was that Ramzan had come and so they could not hold meetings. Was this question also included in the schedule fixed or did it figure at all during the meetings? And then, what is the attitude of the two superpowers before and after the meeting on the Kashmir issue? Because, we know that there has been some change in the US attitude and they are probably talking of the Simla Accord. But I want to know it from the Minister because he had a telephonic talk with Mr. Baker. And this morning also during the Question Hour I had raised this question and the Minister asked me to wait till the statement when he would explain the position, he would tell us of the talks he had with the Americans. Then I also want to know about the position of the Soviet Union on this. The Soviet Union, of course, has been saying that Kashmir is an integral part of India. But certain changes have taken place and new things are happening in Eastern Europe and Mr. Gorbachev is facing serious problems in his country. Therefore, I want to assure myself that there is no change in the attitude of the Soviet Union. He must have received a certain communication from them. Then, China's attitude has also been helpful but I want a confirmation from the Minister that China is no longer that pro-Pakistani which it was in the past. And lastly about the BBC interviews. I raised this question in the morning and the Minister asked me to wait till the statement in the evening. You must have read in the newspapers, BBC with a TV correspondent went to the terrorist camps within Pakistan, Pakistan-occupied terrain. They saw the camps and they took interviews of the terrorists who were being trained by the Pakistanis. These terrorists have given ample material, ample evidence, to show that they were being trained; they, in fact, showed receipts of the money received, transport, arms, etc. And what is more disturbing is this. Since you have been abroad and

[Shri Kapil Verma]

you have very successfully projected our point of view, it will be of interest for you to know and you must have read in the newspapers, that these terrorists have mentioned the names of two countries, Saudi Arabia and Iran. That is disturbing a little and that has prompted me to ask for this clarification. The Iranians first made a certain statement and ultimately they denied it. Now the terrorists who are being trained themselves have given a recorded version to the BBC and that has been projected on the TV, that the Iranians are helping. Now, I want to know the exact position from the Minister. What is his information? Similarly, Saudi Arabia. These people assure us—you must have yourself seen it when you were abroad that probably the Arab countries are not taking so much interest. But now this is disturbing. So we want to know the exact position about this. Thank you.

चौधरी हरि सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : हमारे माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी अमेरिका में बैठक में भाग लेने के बाद लौटे हैं। वहां पर जो विदेशी गणमान्य लोग थे, विदेश मंत्री तथा अन्य राजनेता, उनसे उन्होंने बातचीत की। यह बात भी सही है कि उन्होंने अपना दृष्टिकोण मजबूती के साथ जो विदेशी मंत्रीगण थे उनके सामने रखा। हमारे केन्द्रीय सरकार के मंत्री भी अनेक देशों में गये, वहां पर उन्होंने अपना व्यूपाइन्ट रखा और सारी स्थिति की जानकारी दी। लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी पाकिस्तान की सारी हरकतों पर कोई अंकुश नहीं लगा, किसी भी कारनर से अंकुश नहीं लगा है। पाकिस्तान की जो तोड़फोड़ की कार्यवाहियां हैं, जो काश्मीर के अन्दर और पंजाब के अंदर हो रही हैं, युद्ध का बिगुल बजाने का जो उसकी कार्यवाही है, काश्मीर के संबंध में तो वह बार बार कहते हैं... (**व्यवधान**)।

उपसभापति: आप भाषण मत करिये, सवाल पूछिये क्योंकि मेरे पास दूसरा भी स्टेटमेंट है।

चौधरी हरि सिंह : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि आखिर बातचीत करने का प्रभाव अमेरिका और किस-किस कन्ट्री पर हुआ है? पाकिस्तान के आमक प्रचार को रोकने के लिए क्या तैयारियां की जा रही हैं? दूसरी बात मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि टेरोरिस्ट्स के पास जो हथियार आ रहे हैं वे अफगान मुजाहिदीन की तरफ से भी आ रहे हैं, वह उनको हथियार दे रहे हैं और पाकिस्तान के लोग भी दे रहे हैं और अफगान मुजाहिदीन के पास ये हथियार अमेरिका से आते हैं, अमेरिका उनको हथियार देता है, इसलिए क्या अमेरिकन अथोरिटी से इस बारे में कोई बातचीत हुई है कि काश्मीर के टेरोरिस्ट्स को इस प्रकार से जो हथियार मिल रहे हैं उसको रोकने के लिए अमेरिकन अथोरिटीज से कोई बातचीत हुई है तो वह क्या है?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, the External Affairs Minister during his recent tour abroad, it seems, had some talks as per the statement. But actually I am myself worried, and I want to check up from him, whether the Pakistan Foreign Minister himself and his Government are really serious on defusing the situation or they are playing to their internal problems. A misadventure at some stage will really create chaos in both the countries, and particularly, I know and I have found out from documents, in that, Pakistan will be the biggest sufferer. So what is the assessment of the Foreign Minister, particularly the perception of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and his Prime Minister and other officials in this connection? What is the actual issue? I raised it with the permission of the Deputy Chairman two or three days back. What has happened to Amanullah Khan? It was stated that Amanullah had fled from USA. Is it or is not a fact? I quoted some papers also, of 18th April, 19th April and 22nd April which are relevant. May I know whether there was a lethargy on the part of your Embassy office in USA in submitting the extradition

warrants to the US authorities or not? What is the actual position? We as a country desire Amanullah Khan to be extradicted and punished for murders in Kashmir.

Then, Mr. Minister, I am aware that you handled this problem in a very mature, diplomatic sense. And I think Madam Deputy Chairman also—I was lucky to talk to her—gave her impression of our feelings to Saudi Arabia and other countries. I do not want to quote her because that was my private talk with her. You have gone round and you have sent your officers and Secretaries to foreign countries. I want to know what is your personnel feeling about their attitude because in diplomacy something is for public consumption and something is for action. So, I want to know what is your own assessment in this connection.

Lastly, the Prime Minister's statement about our preparedness for war etc. has created a little scare in the country. Of course, you are not dealing with this matter. All along in the country and in our major cities, particularly in Bombay, bombs are being exploded. I am told as Mr. Mathur was explaining in the morning, pro-Pakistani slogans were raised at Palej and arsenals are being found in Bombay, particularly in the minority community areas and temples. So, I want to know the fall-our effect of not taking strong action and assuring the people of this country that you will rectify this weakness which we, as people, feel.

I read and just now I heard from Mr. Kapil Verma about B.B.C. having interviewed certain terrorists etc. Would you please ask your Minister for Information and Broadcasting to get that on loan and show it to the people of this country? We want it to be shown. This is all verbal talk that we do. It should be shown on the T.V. It can be loaned from the B.B.C. That will give a very effective assurance to the people of this country that what this Government is talking has a rationale behind it. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr Kulkarni, you mentioned my name. Whatever I discussed with you and the discussions I had wherever I have travelled have all been spoken to the press. It is being published. It is no secret.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: As a Parliamentarian, I cannot disclose what I talk to you in your Chamber.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is being published in the newspapers.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal) Madam, I have gone through the statement made by the hon. Minister. The statement mostly says what the newspapers say about the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. But what he has replied to him has been given in a very cryptic way. It is good that he has talked to his Pakistani counterpart in New York. We are always repeating the Simla Agreement. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has disowned the Simla Agreement or they stand by the Simla Agreement. We are repeating the same thing, but they are avoiding it. Do they disown it or do they stand it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Violate.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: My second point is about Amanullah Khan. So far as I understand he is a Pakistani citizen. They deny the Pakistani involvement in Kashmir affairs. But Amanullah Khan is issuing *fatwas* about the execution of our citizens. I would like to know the concrete reply of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan about Amanullah Khan's stay in New York and about his issuing *fatwas* for the execution of our citizens.. Madam, our Government took up the matter with the U.S. Government for extradition of Amanullah Khan. I would like to know whether the U.S Government is actually serious about his extradition. Where does the matter stand now? We have seen re-

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

ports in the press and our Minister has told us in Parliament that we have asked for his extradition. But we want to know where the matter stands now and whether the US Government is still serious about it and whether Amanullah Khan is still in America or he has gone elsewhere and whether his whereabouts are known. We want to know as to what is the stand of the US Government and whether there is at all any sincerity on the part of the US Government about his extradition.

Now, Madam, I would only ask another question. The Minister has said in his statement that openly they are collecting funds. And, in fact, Ms Bhutto has declared that they have opened a Kashmir Fund and they have already contributed some money for that. They have talked about 'Jehad' and making recruitments, etc. All these things are concrete proof about Pakistan's involvement. When our Foreign Minister referred to these issues, what were the concrete replies of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan? Why have they opened the Kashmir Fund? Why have they made advertisement for 'Jehad'? Why are they making recruitments? If that is not the direct involvement, then what else is? All these things are not clear here. The Joint statement issued by both the hon. Ministers is a simplistic one. It does not mean anything. So, I would be glad if the hon. Minister makes some concrete clarification about his talks with his Pakistani counterpart.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If he has said everything, then what clarification would you ask? Now, Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, my feeling is that the statement has not revealed anything. It is rather a repetition of the stand taken by India on many a situation. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he could have a discussion with the Afghanistan Foreign Minister at the United Nations because somewhere I have read that the Afghanistan Minister has said that Inter-service Intelligence organisation of Pakistan which is destabilising Afghanistan are the same instrument in Kashmir also. And we have learnt that the hon. Foreign Minister has met the Foreign Minister of Iran, but we have not learnt that he has met the Afghanistan Foreign Minister. If he has met, we shall be interested to learn from him whether he has broached the subject and the role of the Intelligence Services of Pakistan in Afghanistan and in Kashmir. Secondly, Madam, I would like to know from him whether he could sense something from his meeting with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan as to what is his real position, his real status in Pakistan's political scene and whether he is just a puppet in the Army's hand or he is just trying to over-react to India's situation because of his own position in Pakistan. Then, Madam, I would also like to know from the Minister as to what assurances the American Government has given about the intentions of Pakistan because unilaterally Pakistan has said that they shall not attack India, that they have given an assurance to America. But has the American Government assured our Foreign Minister that they will check Pakistan because either the Afghanistan issue or the American intentions or Iran's foreign diplomacy are all inter-related issues, and we shall like to know from him about this.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीया उपसभापति महोदया, विदेश मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय आर्थिक सहयोग सम्बन्ध विशेष अधिवेशन जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र में 22 से 26 अप्रैल तक हुआ था, उस में कोई ऐसी

नई बात नहीं है जिसकी जानकारी पहले से इस देश को और सारी दुनियां के राजनयिक क्षेत्रों को न रही हो। उन्होंने भारत की चिन्ता जाहिर की है कि जो पाकिस्तान में ट्रेंड टेररिस्ट है या जो सीमा पार करते हैं या जो मस्जिदों में टेररिस्टों के लिए जेहाद की बात की जाती है फ़ातिहा पढ़ा जाता है यह सब तो कहा गया लेकिन बराबर को स्थापित किये गये हैं पाकिस्तान की ओर से काश्मीर के लिबरेशन के लिए। इतना ही नहीं बल्कि काश्मीर जो भारत अधिकृत क्षेत्र हैं उसके समीप आकर पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री घोषणा करते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हजार वर्ष तक युद्ध करेंगे। साहिबजादा याकूब खान ने बराबर अपने स्टैंड पर काश्मीर अधिकृत क्षेत्र को पाकिस्तान का बताने में कहीं कोई कोर कसर नहीं छोड़ी। दोनों विदेश मंत्रियों का तीन प्वाइंटों पर समझौता आया है कि दोनों देशों के सैनिक महानिदेशक सम्पर्क में रहेंगे, संयम बरतेंगे, संचार के माध्यम से खुले रहेंगे। यह समस्या का समाधान नहीं है बल्कि यह एक कागजी कार्यवाही है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि उनके डेलीगेशन में भारत के कौन कौन लोग प्रतिनिधित्व करने गए थे और जिन देशों ने पाकिस्तान का खुले आम समर्थन दिया है उनके राजनयिकों से क्या बातें हुईं और कहां तक वे सहमत हुए या हमारे विदेश मंत्री से प्रभावित हुए कि पाकिस्तान जबर्दस्ती हमारे सीमा क्षेत्र में आतंकवाद फैला रहा है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि स्टीफन सोलार्ज की हिंदुस्तान के प्रति सहानुभूति है लेकिन उन्होंने भी कहा है कि हिंदुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को सोवियत यूनियन की सहायता से इस मामले को हल करना चाहिए। इस संबंध में मंत्री महोदय का क्या कहना है। दूसरा पाकिस्तान के विदेश मंत्री ने युद्ध की संभावना को ओवर रूल नहीं किया है। क्या आश्वासन दिया है कि पाकिस्तान भारत के साथ युद्ध नहीं करेगा। इस संदर्भ में क्या आश्वासन दिया है और विदेशों में जो काश्मीर के आतंकवादी तत्व अमानुल्लाह खान या इस तरह के हैं उन को भारत में लाकर सजा देने के संबंध में उनके ऊपर कानूनी कार्यवाही करने के संबंध में क्या निर्णय आपने वहां किया और क्या बातें विदेशी राजनयिकों से की तथा राष्ट्रसंघ से की? साथ ही पाकिस्तानी हुकूमत क्या सोच रही है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री की जान को जब खतरा है सब आतंकवादी उन्हें चैलेंज दे रहे हैं तो ऐसी स्थिति में पाकिस्तान की हुकूमत क्या सोच रही है, किस रूप में आप उन समस्याओं को हल करना चाहते हैं। सीमाओं के पार जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान आतंकवाद के माध्यम से, धन के माध्यम से, हथियारों के माध्यम से और हमारे हिन्दुस्तान का जो काश्मीर का बार्डर है उसके माध्यम से जो चैलेंज दे रहा है उसमें क्या पाकिस्तान युद्ध नहीं कर सकता है, इसका क्या आश्वासन आपने प्राप्त किया है। इनकी विस्तृत जानकारी सदन को दें।

उपसभापति: डा० अबरार अहमद खान। सवाल ही कीजिएगा।

डा० अबरार अहमद खान (राजस्थान): मैंने तो जो नाम दिया था यह सोचकर दिया था कि काफी दमदार वक्तव्य होगा और इसमें काफी क्रास सवाल पूछे जा सकते है लेकिन वक्तव्य में तो दम वाली बात तो है ही नहीं ... (**व्यवधान**) पढ़ा भी है और सुना भी है। (**व्यवधान**) इनके अंदर मुख्य बात यह है कि जो पाकिस्तान की गतिविधियां हमारे देश के विरुद्ध चल रही हैं जो टेरोरिस्ट एक्टिविटीज चल रही हैं जो कैम्प्स पाकिस्तान में यहां के लोगों को ट्रेनिंग देने के लिए लगाये जा रहे हैं जिस तरह से टेरोरिस्टस को हमारे यहां का बार्डर पार कर यहां भेजा जा रहा है इन सबके बारे में हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी साहिबजादा याकूब खान से कहते रहे और वे हर बात के लिए ना-ना करते रहे। आज हमारे देश के पास हर चीज के साक्ष्य हैं, प्रमाण है। सरकार बार बार इस सदन में कहती रही है और यह सही है कि पाकिस्तान

[डा० अबरार अहमद खान]

भारत के विरुद्ध जो कार्यवाही कर रहा है, किस तरह से ट्रेनिंग कैम्प्स चला रहा है, आतंकवादियों को हमारे देश में भेज रहा है, हथियार भेज रहा है इन सबके हमारे पास साक्ष्य हैं, प्रमाण हैं। मैं माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं कि साहबजादा याकूब खान से जो बातें कीं वे यू हीं साधारण रूप से कीं अथवा ये कहते रहे और बार बार बात के लिए मना करते रहे या साक्ष्यों पर बातें कीं कि हमारे पास इस बात के साक्ष्य हैं, प्रमाण हैं कि पाकिस्तान हमारे देश के अंदर आतंकवादी गतिविधियां चलाने के लिए स्पष्ट रूप से दोषी हैं और ये प्रमाण हैं। और जो दोनों देशों के बीच टकराव और तनाव कम करने के लिए तीन बिन्दुओं पर सहमत हुए, मैं नहीं समझता कि इनमें से कोई भी बिंदु ऐसा हो, जो टकराव या तनाव को कम करता हो।

तो वास्तव में टकराव या तनाव कम करने के लिए आपने यह इसके अलावा भी क्या कोई और बात की, तो उसका भी स्पष्ट ब्यौरा दें?

अंतिम बात मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि आप वहां गये थे, वहां बहुत से देश इस प्रकार, ऐसे थे जो भारत और पाकिस्तान से प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से संबंधित हैं, जो भारत और पाकिस्तान में जो भी गतिविधि होती है, उससे भी प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से संबंधित हैं, यहां की आइडियालोजी और वहां की आइडियालोजी से संबंधित हैं।

तो इस संबंध में आपने किन-किन मुल्कों के राजनीतिज्ञों से बात की और इस संबंध में उनकी क्या प्रतिक्रिया थी, इस बारे में भी सदन को बतायें।
धन्यवाद।

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, after Pakistan was defeated in December, 1971, by India the then Prime Minister of India, late Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, entered into a pact on 3rd July, 1972. It is known as the 'Simla Agreement'. Clause 2 of the Simla Agreement reads as under: "The two countries have resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means, through bilateral negotiations or, by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon between them"

Our External Affairs Minister was in New York from the 22nd to the 26th April. I read in the newspapers that on the 16th April, 1990, the Pakistani Ambassador, Air Marshal Zulfiqar Ali Khan in a statement in Washington, reaffirmed that the Simla Agreement does not bar, in any manner, the raising of the Kashmir issue in any international body including the United Nations, the non-aligned movement, or, the Organisation of Islamic States. In this connection, I would like to know whether the hon. Minister drew the attention of the Pakistani Foreign Minister, Sahabzada Yakub Khan to this statement of the Pakistani Ambassador which, in my opinion, is against the spirit of the Simla Agreement.

Secondly, I would like to know whether, in the near future, there is any programme or plan for our Prime Minister meeting the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, the statement made by the hon. Minister of External Affairs sounds like a Press release. It says: "I took advantage of my visit to New York to have a detailed exchange of views with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan". Should I take it that the initiative was taken by this weak Government of India to have some discussion with Pakistan, or, to beg with Pakistan so that their activities can stop?

The next point is, he mentioned about the training, the supply of arms the creation of the special Kashmir Fund and the various kinds of activities which Pakistan is indulging in. What was the reply? The reply simply is that Pakistan is not doing anything. Did the hon. Minister explain to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan? As my colleague, Dr. Abrar Ahmed Khan, asked, did he give the proof because even in Parliament, our Government, have mentioned that they have proof on this subject? If he had given the proof what was the reaction of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan? If it had not been given, why was it not given?

The statement also says that a Pakistani citizen sitting in the United States has openly asked his so-called followers to assassinate the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in India. Even though there is no co-ordination in this Government, has the External Affairs Minister informed the Home Ministry that enough security should be provided to the hon. Prime Minister and also to the Leader of the Opposition?

Then, Madam, the statement says: "It was very useful". Yes, it was very useful because they could meet. What was the useful purpose served? The statement says that it was agreed that both sides should exercise restraint. I would like to know, in the opinion of the hon. Minister, what kind of restraint they are expecting from the Government of India? I do not think the Government of India is doing anything where restraint is required. The statement says at the end "We are watching the situation". Have we not watched the situation enough? Or, like a paper tiger, is the Government of India only talking? When are they going to take action to stop Pakistan from further intolerable activities? And did the Pakistan Foreign Minister take any clarification about our Government's statement that the training centres in Pakistan may be raided? If so, what was your specific reply to that, or has the Government any real intentions of raiding these camps?

Lastly, Muzaffarabad in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir has become the launching pad where not only the Pakistanis but even Arabians, like Saudi Arabians or Iranians, have been seen loitering around the areas where the JKLF guerillas are taking training. Has Government taken any clarification on this point also?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I have four questions to ask. From the little knowledge I have of diplomacy, generally when a press statement is made saying that they had frank, business-like, useful exchange of views, that means that the talks were a failure. That is the usual diplomatic language used. Indeed I think, from our point of view, from India's point of view the whole exercise has been counter-productive for our country. According to my information, and the Minister should correct me if I am wrong, the Foreign Minister of India has made it clear to both the Pakistan Foreign Minister and the U.S. Secretary of State, whom he subsequently went to brief like a good supplecant . . . (*Interruptions*). That is how it came here in the press and nobody contradicted it. You can ask your Ministry.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: It has never come.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You did go subsequently to meet the Secretary of State.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: I never went.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: There was no contradiction. It was in the press.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It was not in the press.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Everyone of us has seen it. Anywav, you can contradict it when you speak. According to my information, you told the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that we can discuss Kashmir and the settlement of that issue. I am little concerned after reading the statement that there is no statement from the Foreign Minister that Kashmir is an integral part of India, the only thing left to discuss with Pakistan is the retrieval of that portion of Kashmir which is in Pakistan's occupation. The Foreign Minister has said nothing about it except the generally worded point about infringement, sovereignty and so on. I would like the Foreign Minister to make a categorical statement here that the whole of Kashmir is part of India and there is nothing to be discussed with Pakistan on that question.

Secondly, I would like to know whether the Foreign Minister communicated what the Prime Minister here has alluded to that the Government of India would consider preemptive strikes against the camps in Pakistan. If so, what is the reaction, whether it had any desired effect?

The third thing is, I regret to say does he not consider that once again the image of India has become one of parity with Pakistan, that image which was disrupted in 1971 after the Bangladesh war? The way in which the Foreign Minister has gone and met the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and the subsequent remarks of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, clearly demonstrate that India has accepted party with Pakistan.

Finally, I would like to know that, if indeed the U.N. has nothing to do with Kashmir any more, then why is it that 37 personnel of the U.N. are still here and the United Nation's military observers group has a permanent office in Purana Qila road in New Delhi? Why does not the Government of India wind up this office and tell them to go because there is no role for the U.N. to play?

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): Thank you, Madam. I hold the hon. Minister in high esteem, but I was not ready for the contradiction in the statement that he has made. At one stage it says in the last page that the meeting was business-like, and useful exchange of views took place, but earlier he says that the Pakistan Foreign Minister made 'patently propagandist suggestions'. Apparently, you cannot be discussing with a person in good faith, exchanging useful information or ideas when you yourself characterise the other person engaged in making propagandist suggestions. So this is disappointing unless this has been written at two stages, at two levels of thinking without any coordination. I would like to seek a clarification on that as to what exactly is the correct assessment of our Minister so far as the exchange of view is concerned.

The second aspect is, do the three items which have been listed, in his judgment, amount to progress? Does it mean that there has been an added gain in terms of content or direction, so far as bilateral relations are concerned between Pakistan and India? Or is it just, as my friend, Prof. Subramanian Swamy, has said, reporting in a polite language of a non-event or waste of time?

Thirdly, there are problems which the rest of the world knows, whether it is support to terrorism or belligerency in speeches from the government or non-government sources, or trying to bring a third party. We have also tried at that level our efforts, particularly through diplomatic channels. But my specific question to the Minister would be, what is the assessment of the hon. Minister with regard to the clear stand which the

United States of America has in this game? Is it a shift to our advantage? Is it a shift to their advantage? Or is it a new form of neutrality or bringing parity between the two countries? Secondly, what is the position of the USSR in this regard because one has not really seen what exactly is their recent position on a firm basis so far as India's position on Kashmir is concerned?

Fourthly, what China has to say or do in this regard is vital from a bilateral point of view between China and India and from the regional point of view so far as South Asia is concerned. There is a particular stand in the historical context about which we are familiar. There could be some possibility that China should be doing some re-thinking in view of their problems, in view of their changed perception and in view of our own initiative *vis-a-vis* China so far as bilateral issues are concerned. Has there been any meeting of minds or some adjustment with regard to China's stand in this field?

Madam, the next point that I would like to say is that the Minister says in his statement that their stand "might generate unpredictable events which might become uncontrollable". I would like to ask, has the Foreign Minister of Pakistan received a firm message from our Minister that there are possibilities of very predictable events in these unpredictable possibilities? If the message has been conveyed firmly, then perhaps the response of that Government will be of one kind. But if it has been a guarded message, if it has been a vague message, then the response will be equally vague and a procrastinated approach will be evident in the days to come.

Finally, I agree with Prof. Subramanian Swamy and I would like to raise this question: after having realised that the talks were more a propagandist stand by the Pakistan Minister, does the hon. Minister regard that the decision to meet, or allow this meeting to take place at the Cabinet level, was an error of judgment and without sufficient preparation and pre-assessment of the likely response from the counterpart Minister and in that context, will the future steps be more careful than this kind of casual thing? Thank you, Madam.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Madam, I do remember a statement by our External Affairs Minister sometime before he went to New York. In that statement, he contradicted a speculation in the press that he would meet his Pakistani counterpart in New York with the comment that so long as these training centres were not stopped, were not abolished, there was no question of any discussion with the External Affairs Minister of Pakistan. My question would be: In that case what prompted our External Affairs Minister in having a discussion with his Pakistani counterpart? The External Affairs Minister of Pakistan is a mixed Minister in the sense that he politically belongs to the Opposition IJI, but the PPP Premier appointed him for certain obvious reasons. And this gentleman, the last time he came down to New Delhi, tried to browbeat India on the soil of India. So, under what circumstances did this discussion take place?

From the statement it seems that it was really a monologue on the part of the Indian External Affairs Minister; it was not a two-way process. The similarly-worded statement makes certain peculiar observations: "Frank, businesslike and useful exchange of views". Diplomacy has strange requirements but, in the common man's language, the report that has been given by our honourable External Affairs Minister doesn't show that anything useful emerged out of it.

A particular point: All other things could be denied by Sahabzada Yakub

[Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee]

Khan, but could he deny that Amanullah Khan who, from the UN headquarters announced murder, was a citizen of Pakistan? Was Sahabzada Yakub Khan pointedly asked that question and what was his reply? We may not be for war, but these are things which must be straightened out. With this end in view, I would request the External Affairs Minister to be a bit more forthcoming regarding the Pakistani attitude.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, the statement makes clear the consistency of the policy of the Government, the consistency in the fact that it is quite clear to us what the intentions of our neighbour, Pakistan, are towards us.

The honourable Minister has shown great restraint in not naming who has set up the fund in Pakistan, who has made a call for *jehad*. We know that on the Pakistan National Day, at Minar in Pakistan the Pakistan Prime Minister, Mrs. Benazir Bhutto, has categorically made these calls. In the Congress Party we were shown a video tape of that proceeding which was telecast on Pakistan television. It was shown to us by the Congress President; we have seen that. It is quite clear as to who is behind it, what are the forces. You would not name them—you have shown great restraint. But it is quite clear. I would like to know, though we know what the intention of Pakistan is, does Pakistan know what our intention is? It does not know, because we ourselves do not know. We ourselves are following...

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH (Maharashtra): We cannot divulge our intention. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: No, no, I will tell you. We are following a policy of appeasement. This meeting of the External Affairs Ministers itself was a part of that policy of appeasement. And where has this policy of appeasement cut us? It has cut us...

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल : आप रैली में क्यों नहीं गए ?..(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विश्वजित पृथ्वीजित सिंह. आपने क्या कहा, साहब ?

श्री जगेश देसाई (महाराष्ट्र) : वाजपेयी जी की रैली का बोल रहे हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I seek your intervention, Madam. I beg the pardon of the honourable Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, you continue your point and finish your clarification. Mr. Vishvjit Singh, you have only five minutes and I have got six other Members. You continue with your point.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I was continuing till I was interrupted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You don't get interrupted. You ask your question.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Everybody who sees your *Bhagwa* saree, wants to talk about war.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't make comments on sarees. We are discussing something very serious.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Madam, I would like to confine myself to asking how long this policy, once again how long this policy, of appeasement is going to last. This Government when it first came, made noises about how it was going to settle all pending disputes with Pakistan, and you saw the response of Pakistan. You were not willing to believe, when you were in the Opposition that there were training camps in Pakistan. You were not willing to believe, when you were in the Opposition, that it was the Pakistan's hand which was behind the problems

which we were facing in our border districts. Today you are facing those problems, and you are still following that policy of appeasement.

You say this in your last paragraph, and these are very key words. The hon. Minister himself has gone on record after his meeting with Sahebzada Yaqub Khan and after Sahebzada Yakub Khan had contradicted his stand that he feels betrayed. If I am not wrong, this is what the newspapers said.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You have not read any Indian newspapers, it looks.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Please, one minute. I would like to say that in this very statement that policy of appeasement has been carried further. It says:

> "Before concluding, I would like to reiterate that India is wedded to peace. However, GOI would like it to be clearly understood that it would not tolerate infringements of its sovereignty and territorial integrity".

Is what happening today, Madam Deputy Chairman, not an infringement of our sovereignty and territorial integrity? I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether what is happening today, the actions which are being taken by Pakistan, the call for *jihad*, the arming of the militants, the sending of people across the border, the ordering of the executions, the setting up of a fund, are not an infriengement of our sovereignty and our territoril integrity. If it is, and I maintain that it is, then, what is the Government of India going to do about it? Or are we going to sit back and tolerate it once again for the sake of peace?

I would like to have clear answer from the hon. Minister. Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairman.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया (बिहार) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, एक्सटर्नल अफ़यर्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो अपना वक्तव्य रखा है और खास करके पाकिस्तान में बढ़ते हुए तनाव के बारे में उनकी याकूब खान के साथ जो अमरीका में मुलाकात हुई, उस विषय में मैं उनसे पूछना चाहूंगा कि आज ही इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में छपा है कि "यू०एस० कोर्ट रिजेक्ट्स प्ली"। गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया ने अमानुल्लाह खान को डिटेन करके हिंदुस्तान वापस भेजने के लिए जो रिक्वैस्ट की थी वह ब्रुकलिन, न्यूयार्क की कोर्ट ने रिजैक्ट कर दी है। इसके बारे में हिंदुस्तान की सरकार क्या सोच रही है और वह कैसे उसको वापस वहां से लायेंगे ?

महोदया, इन सारी बातों के साथ हमें जो बात समझ में आती है वह यह है कि पाकिस्तान की हिंदुस्तान से यह तनावपूर्ण अवस्था आज की नहीं है बल्कि बहुत पुरानी है। आप अमरीका तो चले गए बात करने के लिए पर जो इस्लामिक कंट्रीज आज तक पाकिस्तान के लिए एल०सीज़ खोलकर अमरीका में देती रहीं कि सारे अस्त्र-शस्त्र तुम पाकिस्तान को सप्लाई करो, इतने एफ़-16 दे दो और उसका एकाउंट जो है, वह सऊदी अरेबिया बैंक से मिल जाएगा। तो क्या उन इस्लामिक कंट्रीज के एम्बेसेडर्स से या वहां के राष्ट्रपति या प्रधान मंत्रियों से आपने कोई बात की है या नहीं ? उनका क्या स्टैंड है कश्मीर पर ? वह पाकिस्तान की इस कार्यवाही पर क्या कहना चाहते हैं ? क्या वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहेंगे या पाकिस्तान का साथ देंगे ? दूसरा, आपने वहां जो तीन मुद्दे तय किए, उसमें एक मुद्दा है कि दोनों को संयम बरतना चाहिए।

6.00 P.M. आप तो बार्डर पर संयम बरत सकते हैं अपने जनरल, ब्रिगेडियर और बड़े-बड़े अफ़सरान को कहकर, गोलियां नहीं चलेंगी, तोपें नहीं दागी जायेंगी, हवाई जहाज नहीं उड़ेंगे, बमबारी नहीं होगी। पर यह जो बमबारी पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर हो रही है, यह जो बमबारी मीनारे पाकिस्तान पर हो रही है उसको आप कैसे रोकेंगे। हजार साल का युद्ध घोषित

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

कर रहा हैं, उधर पाकिस्तान में बैठकर बेनजीर भुट्टो और इधर से युद्ध घोषित कर रहे हैं हमारे राजा विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जो कह रहे हैं कि साइक्लोजिकली प्रिपेयर रहिये वार को लेकर यह तनाव कैसे कम होगा ? उसके लिए कौन सा संयम बरतेंगे ? और उस पर कौन अंकुश लगायेगा ? उसके लिए आपने कोई विचार किया है कि उनके प्रधान मंत्री पर अंकुश लगेगा तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पर भी अंकुश लगेगा ।

महोदया, उसके साथ-साथ मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय जी जरा ध्यान दें तो तो आपरेशन टापक जो कश्मीर को लिबरेट करने के लिए जनरल जिया-उल-हक ने बनाया था और उस वक्त हमारे ही इस मुल्क के दो मंत्री जो एक उड़ीसा के मुख्य मंत्री हैं और एक कश्मीर एफ़ेयर्स के इन्चार्ज हैं जार्ज फ़र्नांडीज साहब, दोनों पाकिस्तान गये थे । उसी वक्त यह आपरेशन टापक ब्लू प्रिंट बना था और उस ब्लू प्रिंट मे कहा गया था कि हमें एक ऐसा आदमी चाहिये क्योंकि 1965 और 71 की लड़ाई में हिन्दुस्तान से हमें बहुत मार पड़ी है, हम अब फ़ौजी कार्यवाही करने में काश्मीर को लिबरेट करने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे, पर हमें एक ऐसा आदमी चाहिए जो हमें इस मामले में मदद कर सके और सौभाग्य से कहिए या दुर्भाग्य से कहिये, आज जार्ज फ़र्नांडीज साहब कश्मीर एफ़ेयर्स के मिनिस्टर हैं और मदद करेंगे इस मामले में, क्योंकि दूसरा उन्होंने एक ओर कहा था कि चीन की ताकत, चीन की सरकार हमें उस वक्त मदद करेगी जब हम हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान की फ़ौजों पर चीन के लम्बे बोर्डर में वह उनको व्यस्त कर देगी कि अपने चीन और भारत के बार्डर से मुक्त होकर पाकिस्तान के बार्डर पर न पहुंच सके । इस पर आपने कोई गौर किया है या आपरेशन टापक की पूरी जानकारी हासिल करते हुए आपने कोई रास्ता अपनाया है कि कैसे इन चीजों को बचाया जा सकता है और कैसे बचा जा सकता है ।

उपसभापति : श्री राम नरेश यादव बहुत ही संक्षेप में सवाल करिये ।

श्री राम नरेश यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, मैं बहुत संक्षेप में तो बोलता ही हूं । महोदया, माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य सदन के सामने रखा, इस वक्तव्य में जिस प्रकार से बातचीत करने के पश्चात निष्कर्ष निकला है उस निष्कर्ष को तीन बिन्दुओं पर इस वक्तव्य में अंकित किया गया है । मैं ऐसा समझता हूं कि इन बिन्दुओं को पढ़ने के पश्चात जिस तरह से कश्मीर की स्थिति है और हमारी राष्ट्रीय एकता और अखंडता को जिस तरह से खतरा पैदा हो गया है और उसकी जिम्मेदारी जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान की रही है, जिस तरह से सरकार कमजोर है लेकिन भारत तो मजबूत है, इस बयान के बाद स्पष्ट हो रहा है कि सचमुच में जिस तरह से कमजोर सरकार है उस कमजोर सरकार ने अपनी कमजोरी का परिचय दिया है ।

महोदया, समझौते के दूसरे बिन्दु मे लिखा है कि हम देखेंगे कि दोनों पक्षों को संयम बरतना चाहिए । इससे यह स्पष्ट हो रहा है कि . . .

उपसभापति : सवाल करें ।

श्री राम नरेश यादव : मैं वही कह रहा हूं कहीं पर भारत की कमजोरी रही है । भारत ने कभी सीमा के पार उधर जाने का नाम नहीं लिया था । उधर पाकिस्तान से ही अतिक्रमण होता रहा । इस आधार पर मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि क्या माननीय मंत्री जी बताने का कष्ट करेंगे कि किस आधार पर अपनी कमजोरी को वहां पर प्रदर्शित कर के अपनी तरफ़ से संयम बरतने का काम किया है यह बतायें कि क्यों भारत की जो 82 करोड़ जनता है, उसको कमजोर दिखाने का काम माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी ने इस बिन्दु को वहां पर रख करके दिखाने का काम

किया, नं०-1, मैं इसलिए जानना चाहता हूं कि भारत मजबूत जब है तो आप इस तरह से कमजोरी का बयान दे करके क्यों देश को गुमराह करना चाहते हैं। दूसरे यह कि प्लेबिसाइट की बात बराबर पाकिस्तान करता रहा है। प्लेबिसाइट के बारे में भी माननीय मंत्री जी ने बात की होगी। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान का और जब दूसरे राजनयिक भी वहां पर आये थे इस प्लेबिसाइट के बारे में पाकिस्तान का जो दृष्टिकोण था, बातचीत करने के पश्चात क्या रिएक्शन रहा पाकिस्तान का? और दूसरे राजनियकों का क्या रिएक्शन था? उसे भी मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं। तीसरी बात यह है कि हमेशा जिस तरह से उधर से शिमला समझौते का उल्लंघन होता रहा है, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि सचमुच में उस संबंध में पाकिस्तान का क्या रिएक्शन था जब आपने उस के बारे में बातचीत की। इसलिए इन तीनों प्रश्नों पर मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का उत्तर चाहता हूं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. Please be brief, because we have to adjourn the House to attend a tea reception by the Chairman.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, the meeting between the Foreign Minister of India and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan may not be counter-productive but at least there is reason to believe that this meeting has not been that fruitful or usful because I am not referring just to press reports, but one has to take cognizance of the press reports. It has been widely reported that Pakistan had gained advantage over India as a result of holding of these talks, I do not know, it is for the Minister to answer. But while going through the statement, I am extremely surprised because in the second page, the hon. Minister has not the guts even to refer to Pakistan. He is just saying "Belligerent and inflammatory rhetoric..". Why Pakistan cannot be named? This refusal on the part of the Minister to name Pakistan in so far as this belligerent action is concerned, can only be interpreted as a sign of weakness rather than as a sign of our wisdom. Therefore, this statement, appears to me rather a bland rhetoric which fails to spell out before the country what the representatives of this Government have done.

Madam, the delegation had gone not only to meet the representatives of Pakistan but to attend the session of the United Nations Assembly. In the first part of the statement, the Minister says that "I had extensive discussions with my counterparts from a large number of countries during my stay in New York." But the Minister does not say what has been the impact of the discussions. It is quite true that Pakistan is interested to have a war with India at least to build up a situation like that. Pakistan can only be brought to sense if we can isolate Pakistan in the international community of nations and in doing that it is essential that we are able to win support among the representatives of other countries. This delegation had an opportunity and the Minister says that he had discussions with a number of counterparts but he is totally silent as to what was the reaction of the conversation that our Government representatives had with the other countries. Therefore, I would like to know in what way he calls this meeting to be "fruitful". That is number one. Number two, has he been able to make out our case to the other countries? Number three, has he been able to build up a case to isolate Pakistan in the inter-national community of nations? This is very important because the...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to adjourn. We have two more speakers.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: One sentence. The Minister had advantage of getting the advice of a number of leading political advisers because he was referring to hon. Shri Vajpayee and other people. Therefore, what did this delegation do in putting across our case to the other representatives of Governments?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, आपके माध्यम से सबसे पहले मैं गुजराल साहब को इस बात की बधाई दूंगा कि उन्होंने रूस-अमेरिका दोनों के इस प्रस्ताव को कि उनके तहत बैठकर पाकिस्तान के साथ बातचीत की जाए, ठुकरा दिया। यह पहला मौका है जब दो बड़ी शक्तियों के विरोध में पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करते समय सरकार ने एक अच्छा मजबूत रवैया अपनाया यह रवैया अपनाया जाना चाहिए। (**व्यवधान**) वक्तव्य मुख्यतः पाकिस्तान के बारे में है लेकिन आपने एक वाक्य में कहा है कि इन्टरनेशनल इकोनामिक कोआपरेशन के और देशों के लोगों से मिला हूं। एक अलग प्रश्न चाहता हूं कि अन्य किन देशों के लोगों से आपकी भेंट हुई है और क्या फिजी के बारे में कहीं कोई जिक्र किया या नहीं ? फिजी में जो हालत हैं वह सब को मालूम हैं।

पाकिस्तान पर आता हूं। आपने कहा :

"The Directors-General of Military Operations of India and Pakistan should remain in touch with each other;"

सामान्यतः सीमाओं पर जब कुछ थोड़ा बहुत तनाव होता है तो वहां की जो बार्डर सेक्योरिटी फोर्स है उनके अफसरान को कहा जाता है कि वे आपस में संबंध रखें। यह जो डायरेक्टर जनरल आफ मिलिटरी आपरेशन की बात आई है यह क्यों आई है ? किस सीमा तक वहां पर तनाव है ? क्या बी०बी०सी० की रिपोर्ट जो पहले सप्ताह की थी कि वहां पर गोलियां चलीं और पाकिस्तान के लोग कुछ मारे गये, इसका कहीं उल्लेख आया या नहीं ? तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि शिमला एग्रीमेंट के अनुसार इस इस सवाल को किसी इंटरनेशनल फोरम पर सामान्यतः नहीं उठाया जाना चाहिए, लेकिन पाकिस्तान बराबर इस सवाल को उठाता रहा है। इसलिए खुलेआम सीधे रूप में आपने पूछा है कि शिमला एग्रीमेंट को मानना चाहता है या नहीं ? क्या यह एक तरफा चल रहा है और वह शिमला एग्रीमेंट को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है और केवल भारत ही शिमला समझौते से बंधा हुआ है ? ऐसी स्थिति है या नहीं, यह स्पष्ट किया जाय। चौथी बात यह है कि अपने वक्तव्य में मंत्री महोदय ने उच्च स्तर की बातचीत का जिक्र किया है, लेकिन बातचीत के बाद जो सरकारी कर्मचारी होते है उनके लेवल पर डिटेल में बातचीत होती है। इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि पहली बात तो डायरेक्टर जनरल मिलिटरी आपरेशन के बारे में है कि सीमा पर शांति बनाये रखने के लिए आफिशियल लेवल पर कोई डिटेल निकली है ? अगर निकली है तो उसकी डिटेल क्या हैं ? अंतिम सवाल मेरा यह है कि इस्लामिक देशों की कांफ्रेंस में पाकिस्तान इस सवाल को उठाता रहा है और अरेबिया और इरान का रवैया हमारे सामने साफ है। उस कांफ्रेंस में किसी इस्लामिक देश ने पाकिस्तान का विरोध नहीं किया और भारत का समर्थन भी नहीं किया और जहां तक इंडिकेशन्स मिलो हैं इसमें पाकिस्तान का समर्थन ही है, इसकी बैकग्राऊन्ड में मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या सऊदी अरबिया और ईरान के अलावा आपकी अन्य देशों के प्रतिनिधियों से बातचीत हुई है और क्या आपको भरोसा है कि यह डिप्लोमेटिक बातचीत सही होगी है या इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस में जो यह सवाल उठाया जाता है वह सही होता है, आपका इस विषय में अनुमान क्या है ?

श्री मोहम्मद खलीलुर रहमान (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : हमारे फारन मिनिस्टर साहब ने जनरल एसेम्बली के स्पेशल सेशन में सिरकत कर उसका पूरा पूरा फायदा उठाते हुए इंडियन सब-कांटिनेन्ट में तनाव कम करने की कोशिश की है। पाकिस्तान

के फारेन मिनिस्टर से उन्होंने गुफ्तगू की जिसमे तो तीन बातों का जिक्र उन्होंने किया है । इस बातचीत को खत्म हुए अभी एक हफ्ता ही हुआ है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस बातचीत से कोई सुधार हुआ है या नहीं ? दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जनरल एसेम्बली मे शिरकत करते हुए उन्होंने दुनियां के दूसरे मुल्कों के नुमाइन्दों से भी बातचीत की, गुफ्तगू की, तो उनका इस बारे मे क्या रिएक्शन रहा ?

†[شری محمد خلیق الرحمان (آندھرا پردیش) : ہمارے فارن منسٹر صاحب نے اسمبلی کے اسپیشل سیشن میں شرکت کر اسکا پورا پورا فائدہ اٹھاتے ہوئے انڈین سب کانٹینینٹ میں تناؤ کم کرنے کی کوشش کی ہے - پاکستان کے فارن منسٹر سے انہوں نے گفتگو کی جسمیں دو تین باتوں کا انہوں نے ذکر کیا ہے - اس بات چیت کو ختم ہوئے ابھی ایک ہفتہ ہی ہوا ہے - میں یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس بات چیت سے کوئی سدھار ہوا ہے یا نہیں - دوسری بات میں یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ جنرل اسمبلی میں شرکت کرتے ہوئے انہوں نے دنیا کے نمائندوں سے بھی بات چیت کی گفتگو کی - تو انکا اس بارے میں کیا ری ایکشن رہا -]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As I announced sometime ago that there is a reception by the Chairman at 6.15 P. M., I think, the reply to these questions should be tomorrow soon after the Question Hour.

†[ ] Translation in Arabic Script.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYE (Madhya Pradesh): Only new Members have been invited?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have been invited whether I am old or new. I do not know about others.

आज सुबह माथुर साहब ने एक मुद्दा उठाया था, उन्होंने स्पेशल मेंशन मे डिमान्ड की थी कि मंत्री महोदय एक वक्तव्य, स्टेटमेंट रखें कि बी०जे०पी० और आर०एस०एस० के वालिंटियर को मारा है, कत्ल किया गया है और दूसरा बलात्कार हुआ है। इस सारे पर वक्तव्य आया है। अगर आप चाहे तो इस पर कल वक्तव्य हो जाय।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : कल हो जाएगा।

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to make an announcement I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 2nd May 1990, allotted two days each for the discussions on the working of the....Ministries of Commerce and Civil Aviation (*Interruption*). The Committee also recommended that the House should sit up to 6.00 p.m. daily and beyond 6.00 p.m. as and when necessary for the transaction of business.

Tomorrow, after the Question Hour, there will be the reply of the External Affairs Minister and then we would take up the other statement by the Minister.